



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,205	09/12/2000	James H. Parry	21706-04982	6898

33438 7590 02/01/2005

HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP  
P.O. BOX 203518  
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER

BARNIE, REXFORD N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 02/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/660,205	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PARRY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> REXFORD N BARNIE	<b>Art Unit</b> 2643	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 05 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see the attached paper.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
**REXFORD BARNIE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The applicant argued that the combination fails to teach a central “pool” of resources used to compensate for feedback formed by a microphone pickup from a speaker.

The examiner disagrees with the assertion that headsets cannot cause echo feedback or noise in general based on (page 10 of applicant’s argument). The volume of the speaker and the close proximity of the speaker and microphone can or could cause echo or feedback in general.

Furthermore, the examiner cited secondary references, which teaches that pooling of resources including echo-cancellers and so forth is notoriously well known as can be shown by the number of secondary references cited by the examiner to teach pooling of resources for signal processing purposes.

Kinoshita et al. teaches a method for supporting communications among a plurality of communications terminals comprising the steps of receiving audio signals from communication terminals at a centralized location in (see figs. 6, 8, 16, 22), digital signal processing resources including echo cancellers, amplifiers, mixers in (see fig. 16) which would be assigned to audio signals, processing the audio signals according to certain parameters and formulating mixes and then sending them back to the respective terminals in (see fig. 16). Kinoshita fails to teach pooling and assigning resources based on availability.

It’s well known in the art to pool and assign resources including signal processing resources based on availability.

Hamilton et al. teaches a call processing using line characteristics wherein resources including signal-processing resources can be assigned based on availability in (see col. 5). Furthermore, signals from a channel or line can be processed to reflect characteristics associated with it.

Wintour teaches a method and system for echo cancellation in 910 of fig. 1) which controls signal processing resources including echo cancellation in (see col. 5 lines 12-15, 46-55).

Holland et al. teaches a call processing system with resources on platforms in (see cols. 2, col. 3 line 61, col. 4) wherein resources can be polled for and allocated based on availability.

Dunn et al. teaches a method and apparatus for echo cancellation with self-deactivation in (see col. 4 line 25-60 and col. 8) wherein resources can be allocated based on availability and pooling.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching either one of the secondary references into that of Kinoshita in cases where they might be fewer resources than required, reduce cost associated with having to provide more resources, making it possible to control and set up services based on availability of resources in order to avoid interference and conflicts when utilizing resources during communication set up.

*The combination including Kinoshita teaches an echo canceler (see figs, col. 16 line 64-col. 17 line 15, col. 22) which would remove all echo including any feedback but for the sake of argument, the examiner has supplemented the combination with Lewis*

Art Unit: 2643

*who teaches an acoustic feedback correction to be used in a conferencing facility including an echo cancellation and according to Lewis in (see cols. 1-2) feedback from a loudspeaker to a microphone is known to emit an echo and to combat this problem, an echo cancellation means including an adaptive filter can be used.*

*Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lewis into that of the combination thus making it possible to combat any known noise including echo caused by close proximity of a speaker and microphone to each other to enhance signal clarity in a conferencing facility.*

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **REXFORD N BARNIE** whose telephone number is (703)306-2744. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CURTIS KUNTZ can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

  
**REXFORD BARNIE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Art Unit: 2643

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PRIMARY EXAMINER  
REXFORD BARNIE  
01/25/05

*RBarnie*  
REXFORD BARNIE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER